

THE

THE TRUE AMERICAN.

Devoted to Universal Liberty; Gradual Emancipation in Kentucky; Literature; Agriculture; the Elevation of Labor Morally and Politically; Commercial Intelligence, &c. &c.

VOLUME I.

TERMS.

THE TRUE AMERICAN is published every Tuesday, at TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS per annum, in advance or THREE DOLLARS if not paid within three months.

Five copies will be furnished to a club for Ten Dollars, or Ten copies for Twenty Dollars.

Subscriptions out of Kentucky payable in advance.

All remittances at the risk of the Editor.

ADVERTISING.

One square, or less, three insertions, \$1.50
For each subsequent insertion, 25
One square, three months, 60
One square, six months, 100
One square, twelve months, 180

The very large and increasing circulation of THE TRUE AMERICAN, in this and other States, will render it a better advertising medium than any paper in the city.

PAUL REEDMAN, Agent in Cincinnati.

AGENTS FOR THE TRUE AMERICAN:

CALEB HARTSHORN, of Boston, sole agent for the six New England States. All letters addressed to him, post paid, at his office, No. 39 Washington street, Boston.

FINCH & WERN, 118 Nassau street, New York, for the State of New York.

ELIJAH PHILIPSON, W. cor. of Green and Ridge Roads, Philadelphia, Pa.

FOURIER ASSOCIATION—The Harbinger.

We give place below to some strictures upon us, because of our article in the 18th No. upon Fourierism. We number among our warmest personal and political friends, some men and women holding the doctrine of "association"—the Harbinger has condescended to notice our efforts in the cause of liberty, and award us a position far above our merits, (although we feel that we deserve somewhat the sympathies of all true men)—we shall therefore take censure with the same spirit, that we do praise, being neither elated by one, nor depressed by the other.

We are not learned in metaphysical disputation; and have no taste or time for the trial and no ambition to triumph in speculative philanthropy! Seeing great and pressing evils lying across our path in life, we cannot from our organization go round them, and we could not if we could. We shall deem ourselves happy, when our lamp is extinguished, if it shall be said of us, there was one who dared to do right, at whatever cost of personal and spiritual care. We think we have fully proven to the world—that every small portion of it to whom we are known,—that we shall not sacrifice an honest and manly expression of our sentiments to friend or foe. It is far easier, in life, to cater to the crimes and delusions of men, than to incur their censures, by a faithful setting forth of the right, and the true, as we see it. We do not profess to be wise, but honest. If any other man or set of men, shall be gifted with a broader insight into the nature of things, than we,—much more if by self-sacrifice, they shall lead the way to truth and happiness, which are the temple of the Living God, none shall exceed us in profound admiration and reverence.

We aspire not to the "profundity" of "philosophy"; and have no reverence for the "ridiculous". If we are not "clear sighted" and "qualified," we submit that "philanthropy" should bear the *reproach*. As to matters of "faith" we are used to hold it "unphilosophical" to condemn for any *faith*. We were foolish enough to believe that men were responsible for not acting up to the faith on the conscience that is in them! If faith be a crime—there is many an honest man damned! Can the word "infamous" apply to *faith* in any case whatever? For our part we are prepared to condemn neither Malthus nor Fourier.

The truth is, we did not approach the subject of association with "levity." We gave our candid opinion of it with freedom, because of our sympathy for general humanity without the bounds of "Kentucky." It is the sick who need a physician—if the wound is not to be probed, it is not necessary to call him. If association be found upon the nature of man, our mistake or shallow ideas, will not retard its success, for we did not profess to "understand" it. If it be not founded on the nature of man, it were better that all should receive a timely warning, that they were entering on an unknown sea, full of whirlpools and breakers! If we had treated the subject with a "sneer" we should have found it easier, and have been sufficiently common place! We did not utter it, because we did not feel it. On the contrary, wherever we see an honest spirit striving for the removal of those thousand ills which press upon humanity, he has our respect and sympathy—true philanthropy may cause the cold hearted to mock, but is never ridiculous. The world's convention! What is there in it to cause "levity"? The Harbinger cannot vindicate it from censure? Association is different; it attempts to do it is not more words! Heaven forbid that we throw cold water upon any attempt to raise fallen man! We say again that they may succeed; we hope they may—but yet we want *faith*. Brothers, be prepared on all hands; let the good that ye do be your reward; for hope unattained is an ashen apple to hungry lips!

Let us see, the associationists claim "social equality." Now if sociability is founded upon the same principle as friendship, which acknowledges equality wherever it meets with sympathies!—and it can be founded upon no other—and there is an admitted difference in "tastes" and consequently in "sympathies," how "in the

name of all the Gods at once" is "social equality" possible? "Equality of conditions" we both agree is impossible— "Equality of rights," is attainable; for that we contend. The socialists overlook this possible, for the equality of sociality, which is impossible! The meaning of the Declaration of Independence is *true*.—The word "equal" was not the word which ought to have been used, because in one sense it is not true, and gives room for evil. It is not possible perhaps to find a single word to fit its place; the idea intended for is,—that men are, or ought to be, allowed the free and unrestrained use of spirit and body, so far as is compatible with the law of nature and God.—In other words, no man or set of men, ought to put a disqualification on another, which God has not put upon him. That law which makes me a Lord of England, is unequal, because whatever merit B. has who was born at the same time, he cannot be a Lord! That law which gives me the property of my father, and thus gives me an advantage over B. who has the same sympathy with labor as to with capitalists and no merit. We deny his qualification to intercede. Something more is necessary to come to a judgment upon a question which lies so deep in the heart of social physiology, as that of labor and its elevation, than mere independence of position, and freedom from the bias of party;—and this Mr. Clay will probably discover before he is many years older. If he is a philosopher he will soon see that in warring with slavery he has but commuted the combat with one of the most hideous features which the question presents, and that when he has triumphed and blotted it out of existence, Proteus like, it will assume new shapes equally formidable; and if he is a philanthropist, which we trust he is, although he rather sneeringly repudiates the idea in another place, he will not cease his efforts for "the elevation of labor," with the bursting of the shackles of Kentucky slavery.

The True American bears as one of its mottoes, "The Elevation of Labor Morally and Politically." This motto shows us exactly how far Mr. Clay's views extend on this question, if he had never said another word on the subject—it is not mere independence of position, but in the elevation of the laborer as an efficient butcher of his fellow creatures; (military glory has not yet fled from the earth!) and still worse we have seen that "refinement" which does not shrink at maiming human victims to minister to its delicate subtleties and luxuriant wants. Does he need an example in the other side, showing that the labor is not always as noble to the refined, which is certainly as odious and abominable? Your country washer-woman, are they not as noble? Yes, and a singular rest in their occupations. But ask the first lady, ever so refined and cultivated, who is still a woman, and will she tell you that she likes to wash and cook sometimes. Is she not the first, but try another and you will find the taste independent of the refined.

Then, then, giv' an idea of what we mean by making labor agreeable, or attractive. We satisfy the natural instinct of every one, by employing them in these functions which they are drawn and adapted; and do not by a presumption as to all, that all labor should be agreeable to all men, force the "few" to perform to the "teeth" which the "head" is about to eat?

We have exceeded our limits and cannot notice other points in the article of the True American, at which we do not, if we have space, to show how the whole nation is in error in their appreciation of Mr. Clay's views of "association," and if he did not lead us into a迷津 of sophistry and a proper interpretation of the doings of Association, we shall be satisfied.

The Harbinger, published by the Brook Farm Phantasm," at New York and Boston, is one of the noblest and most original and interesting journals of the day. Price \$2 a volume. The second volume is just coming in. Letters directed to either of those places will reach the agents.

ITEMS.

MARSHAL IN KEN. — We have two Marshals in our service. The centre now in command of the Kentucky militia is Major-General John A. Harlan, 44 years old, and in command of the southern Kentucky militia is Major-General J. W. C. Frémont, 45 years old.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question was decided in favor of the government.

WE HAVE TWO CLAIMS TO OWNERSHIP OF THE FORT WASHINGTON.—Did there ever exist such a claim?—We have

had it. It was presented without this argument. Made it a matter of contention—set it down as a political question, whether or not the government has a right to own the fort, and the question

THE TRUE AMERICAN

"GOD AND LIBERTY."

LEXINGTON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23.

The Louisville Institute.

Since our last notice of this extraordinary gathering of the knights of the scalpel and balances, fifty names have been added to the list of students. It now stands at 350, whilst Transylvania numbers about 150 or 170! For our part we think the lives and safety of our people in eminent danger!—Would it not be well to appoint a committee of our most respectable citizens, to proceed forthwith to Louisville and abate the "nuisance"?

The Response.

Well—the response to our appeal which has come from conventions and meetings has filled a side of our journal for two months! In the whole North not one meeting has stood by the Robbers, and but one so called whig press in all the free states—the *New York Courier and Enquirer*, has justified the rebels! Out of all Kentucky—one hundred counties—but four or five have sustained the mob by doubtful majorities leaving about ninety-five against them! Not one meeting in the slave states, leaving out Kentucky, has stood by the assassins—whilst all, or the main body of the press whig and democratic, have denounced them—in Baltimore—in St. Louis—in Louisville—and other places! If the Courier and Enquirer and the Philadelphia dinner committee prefer to honor those, who stood a thousand against one sick man—contending for their liberty as well as his own!—we shall not on that account, or for any man's snares or blame, be justified from the firm stand where honor and conscience place us? Against them, too, as against the rebels of the 18th, we are ready to appeal to "Kentucky and to the world" and with unbroken faith, to abide the verdict! The following article does not reach us as we know it does not represent the feelings of the party to whom it is addressed.

From the *Cleveland American*.

Response of the Whigs to the "Appeal."

C. M. Clay.

Mr. Editor.—Perhaps you remember that C. M. Clay in his "Appeal" to the world in vindication of his course, appealed to his brother whigs of the Union, "against the robbery and murderous intentions of Henry Clay's son and Kentucky whigs?" This was proper on the part of C. M. Clay, as he was then seeking the support of every thing good and right. Mark, he appeals to his "brother whigs of the Union," not of the north merely.

The whigs of the south, out of Kentucky, agree with the whig robbers and murderers of that State. But what say the whigs of the north to the "Appeal?"

The *Ohio Standard*, you know, is the organ of the Ohio Whigs, which sets in this case of an "Appeal." Well, the editor of that paper says: "Cassius M. Clay has made some allusions to Henry Clay and the whigs in his late paper that can do no good." This is as much as to say that C. M. Clay has received no treatment from "Henry Clay's son, or the Kentucky whigs," of which he has any reasonable complaint.

I say by the last American, the whigs of Philadelphia proposed to give "Henry Clay's son," one of the robbers of C. M. Clay's property a dinner. This is saying, on the part of the whigs of Philadelphia, that they have a great regard for thieves—James B. Clay being leader of a band. What w. i. C. M. Clay now say of the "tender mercies" of "his brother whigs of the Union?" F. B. P.

Nov. 25th 1845.

P. S.—I see by C. M. Clay's *True American* of the 18th inst., that he thinks it "exceeding bad taste" for Abolitionists to advise him to leave the whig party. Now let me ask why it is that Mr. C. belongs to the whig party? His answers because the "biggest interest of our country is in the whig party." No doubt Mr. C. will say that the "biggest interest of our country" demands the abolition of slavery. But is the whig party in favor of slavery? If he cannot, he degrades himself to a level with the meanest of the mean worshippers of that party by remaining in it. If C. M. Clay's "achromatic mind," carried him to such a conclusion, it must have been drawn from the leaders of the whig party, it must be strongly elicited with the adverb of a whipped spaniel.

F. B. P.

Surgery—Dr. Bush.

It has always been our delight to give our humble testimony to the merit of ambitious young men. Dr. Bush is a native Kentuckian and a self made man—he has studied in Paris; and had the good fortune, like some others whom we could name, to bring back a high knowledge of surgery, instead of *Jacobinical* principles! We are assured that he is now the first surgeon in the city of Lexington, if not the best on this side of Louisville. We hope Transylvania or the Louisville Institute will ere long be able to add his name to their talented faculties. It will be seen from the following card, that Dr. B. has been compelled to devote himself exclusively to surgery; but some few cases of desperate hazard, which he was lately prevailed upon to undertake and cure, after some others had pronounced them hopeless, will cause many to regret his determination to give himself entirely to that branch of medical science, where he will very soon stand unrivaled.

NOTICE.—Dr. R. R. Frazee begs leave to announce to the citizens of Lexington and its vicinity, that he has declined the practice of Medicine, and will devote himself hereafter exclusively to THE PRACTICE OF SURGERY.

Bennett's Hotel, July 2, 1845.

The Committee of Sixty—Aho!

It is well known in this community that a great many of that committee did not approve of the proceedings of the 18th and refused to have any thing to do with robbery!

All those who did not approve of its proceedings are requested to give us their names by letter or by word, as it may save them and their friends from some dishonor, if not many evils in coming time! The Lexington papers if they dare, will confer a favor upon the committee by giving this their full insertions!

The Citizen of a Republic, by Ansai Webster, Translated and Edited by C. E. Edwards, Lester, N. Y. 1845.

We have read this work with pleasure; but are constrained to estimate it rather low in the scale of the great minds of men. It is like the drawing room calisthenics of modern female teachers. Away with your attitude rising—your hot bed plans—giving us "a spark of nature's fire," the wild flowers of the hills and valleys! We would not give one of Plutarch's lives for a library of such works.

Religion and Politics—The Union.

Religion and politics, from time immemorial, and in all nations, till the United States sprung into an independent existence, have been infinitely united. The Jewish government was a theocracy. In the most celebrated nations, religion and temporal affairs, were intimately united, and the most eminent statesmen aspired to the sacerdotal honors as the first among men. The Pope is a temporal prince, as well as teacher of Divinity. The English church acknowledges the King or Queen as its temporal or spiritual head; and the high dignitaries of the church compose in part the House of Lords, one of the equal branches of legislation and the highest court of judicature. The same thing prevails among savage and civilized nations; and, during the last war, we saw the Prophet exercised as much power as the illustrious Tecumseh. The prominent nations of antiquity invoked the gods in great emergencies of civil administration, and solemnly implored their protection in peace and in war. The rape of Helen was deemed impious, and the cause of the destruction of Troy; and it fell all powerful as it was, under the wide-spread and indignant enthusiasm of confederated Greece. The very last great struggle for national reputation among men, the French Revolution, was caused by the decay of religious feeling; and it owes its bloody and unsatisfactory result to impiety, and a defiance of the living God.

It is too true that ambitious men, insinuating themselves into sacred places, have often polluted them with blood and crime; but it would be extreme hardihood to attribute to religion those relentless persecutions and selfish cruelties which, it seems plain, would have been far more rampant if unrestrained by her divine institutions.

The persecutions which our fathers received in the old world from the English and Scottish churches, made us jealous of priestly rule. We declared in our constitution, that there should never be any "religious test;" and that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The same provisions were followed up in most of the State constitutions, in Kentucky, and other States, clergymen are excluded from legislative power.

Now part of this is right, and part, in our judgment, utterly wrong. As, on the one hand, we readily agree that a man's faith should not be the ground of giving him privileges not allowed on of another faith; so a man's faith should not disqualify him for office, or take from him privileges which other men of a different faith enjoy. And whilst we cheerfully agree, that "no religious test" should prevail, and "no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" be made, we deny the justice, or policy, of excluding clergymen from office.

The equilibrium of the different sects is in our security, against religious supremacy and intolerance; and as it protects us out of doors, so would it protect us in legislative halls. It is admitted, on all hands, that never before, in the history of nations, has any government become so suddenly corrupt as ours. We know that the first minds of the Union attribute this lamentable state of affairs to slavery. Well, that may be true; but if common opinion, and constitutional disqualification, had not driven our intelligent and large-souled divines from legislative halls, who does not believe that the warning voice of religion, and mercy, and far-sighted self-interest might have checked, if not destroyed, this national and deadly crime?

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"We copy the paragraphs which, from the records probably known, is conducted by Cassius M. Clay, and which, we are glad to say, is also known to us. It would be painful to us, and probably to many others, if he would state the grounds on which he holds the conclusion, said, that Great Britain will do all she can to avoid war—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

"The position of Great Britain is well understood. She will do all she can to avoid a war. There is no interest to do so, and her government respects that. But if provoked too hard—boarded by us, and in the face of claims we take or prepare to take military possession of Oregon—blows will fall fast enough—war in the bloodiest aspect be upon us."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

"The position of Great Britain is well understood. She will do all she can to avoid a war. There is no interest to do so, and her government respects that. But if provoked too hard—boarded by us, and in the face of claims we take or prepare to take military possession of Oregon—blows will fall fast enough—war in the bloodiest aspect be upon us."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

"The position of Great Britain is well understood. She will do all she can to avoid a war. There is no interest to do so, and her government respects that. But if provoked too hard—boarded by us, and in the face of claims we take or prepare to take military possession of Oregon—blows will fall fast enough—war in the bloodiest aspect be upon us."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

"The position of Great Britain is well understood. She will do all she can to avoid a war. There is no interest to do so, and her government respects that. But if provoked too hard—boarded by us, and in the face of claims we take or prepare to take military possession of Oregon—blows will fall fast enough—war in the bloodiest aspect be upon us."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

"The position of Great Britain is well understood. She will do all she can to avoid a war. There is no interest to do so, and her government respects that. But if provoked too hard—boarded by us, and in the face of claims we take or prepare to take military possession of Oregon—blows will fall fast enough—war in the bloodiest aspect be upon us."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

"The position of Great Britain is well understood. She will do all she can to avoid a war. There is no interest to do so, and her government respects that. But if provoked too hard—boarded by us, and in the face of claims we take or prepare to take military possession of Oregon—blows will fall fast enough—war in the bloodiest aspect be upon us."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war between them—these are self evident truths which none but a fool or madman would think of disputing."

The Boston Courier copies these remarks, with the following comment:

"The dispute about Oregon is waxing warmer, and our administration seems disposed to put it in a position which shall make conflict unavoidable. That it might be settled—that it ought to be—that peace is for the interest of the United Kingdom, and that the spirit of chivalry and honourable spirit could produce a war

